UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,720	12/28/2001	Earl J. Braxton	NMC104A US	2817

21133 7590 04/27/2004

VAN OPHEM & VANOPHEM, PC
51543 VAN DYKE
SUITE 103
SHELBY TOWNSHIP, MI 48317-4447

EXAMINER	
PHILLIPS, CHARLES E	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3751	

DATE MAILED: 04/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/034,720	BRAXTON, EARL J.	
	Examin r	Art Unit	
	Charles E. Phillips	3751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7-10,12-15 and 17-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *4,9,14 and 18-20* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5,7,8,10,12,13,15 and 17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahl in view of Tegg et al.

Dahl teaches a toilet shelter employing four walls which can be folded to a state best shown in Fig. 2 where adjacent walls lie superimposed. Lacking in Dahl is a base, which is circumscribed by the side walls. Tegg et al teach a knock down toilet where base 11 is employed and shown to be circumscribed by the sides of the unit. As both teach toilet enclosures it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan to provide Dahl with a base and roof cooperating with the sides as taught by Tegg et al as the use of perfecting features of one device in the environment of another like device would have been prima facie obvious in order to glean the properties of said features.

Alternatively it would have been obvious to provide for the use of the wall connection scheme of Dahl to replace the scheme of Tegg et al, as the two would have constituted obvious alternative disassembly schemes both shown used in identical art devices. The claim 5 " commode" is taught by Tegg et al at 53.

Claims 3, 8, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the art as applied to claim1 above, and further in view of Braxton '836.

The latter teaches the use of rivets in col. 3, line 22, the use of which in Dahl would have constituted an obvious expedient known to the artisan.

The post –final arguments were answered in the paper of 3/9/04.

With respect to the motivation for combining the base of Tegg et al with Dahl nothing more than common sense is required and the level of skill cannot be promoted to reside at such a level that the provision of an enclosure with a floor is deemed invention. Any ordinary skilled artisan would find in abundantly obvious to provide a structure with a floor. However, going beyond this the examiner provides Tegg et al where an enclosure used for the same purpose as Dahl teaches employing a floor. Nothing more is required by any reasonable mandate of current practice. As to the newly added terms " stackable" and "for transporting said portable shelter"; any flat element is " stackable" and the latter clause defines no structure not taught here in that both devices here are transportable. The intermediate step of Fig 2 of Dahl clearly anticipate this.

Claims 4, 9, 14 and 18-20 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 5.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Charles Phillips at telephone number 308-1515.

Phillips/Dl

April 22, 2004

Charles E. Phillips
Primary Examiner